REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated April 10, 2007. A one-month extension of time accompanies this Amendment. Claims 38-54 are all the claims pending in the application. With this Amendment, independent claims 38, 43 and 48 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment; thus, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action includes the following prior art rejections: claims 38, 39, 42-44, 47-49, and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the Applicants' admitted prior art (hereafter "AAPA"); and claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 50 and 51 stand under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA and Schell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,735, hereafter "Schell"). However, independent claims 38, 43 and 48 have now been amended. For the reasons discussed below, it is submitted that the amended claims are clearly distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Amended independent claim 38 recites, in relevant part, "[a] storage-based broadcasting system which stores a plurality of contents to provide a service...said system comprising:

transmission means...wherein: each of the plurality of contents includes a content body and a content header...the content body is one of a service content body...and a browser content body...said transmission means comprises...

a content body pitcher for outputting each of the plurality of content bodies stored in the storage means,

content assembler means for assembling a content by adding the respective content header to each of the plurality of content bodies outputted from said content body pitcher," and

"*multiplexer means* for multiplexing the content assembled by said content assembler means...."

These features of the present invention are now similarly recited in independent claims 43 and 48. At least the recited "content body pitcher," and "content assembler means" noted above are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies exclusively on the AAPA for disclosing the "content body pitcher" and "content assembler means" noted above and recited in independent claims 38, 43 and 48. The Examiner relies on pages 1-11 of the AAPA. However, these cited portions of the AAPA appear to fall short of the present invention at least for the reasons noted below.

First, the AAPA does not disclose a content assembler that adds respective content headers to each content body. In the Office Action, the Examiner points to the use of browser identifiers (e.g., B(S1)) and service content identifiers (e.g., C(S3,2)) in the AAPA (see e.g., Fig. 25). However, the Applicants respectfully disagree. The identifiers B(S1), C(S3,2) noted by the Examiner are merely reference symbols used for the purposes of explanation of a conventional broadcast system. These identifiers are neither defined as header or content flags for content bodies, nor defined as being added to respective content bodies by a content assembler.

Second, the AAPA does not disclose a content body pitcher that outputs both content body types (e.g., browser and service content bodies). Specifically, the AAPA in Fig. 24 illustrates a transmitting apparatus 2510 of a broadcast system 2500. In Fig. 24, each browser content body stored in browser storage 2511a, and each service content body stored in content storage 1113a require separate pitcher devices 2513a, 2514a. In other words, there is no single content body pitcher device that outputs both browser and service content bodies. Conversely, the transmitting apparatus of the present invention includes a content body pitcher for outputting content bodies, wherein each of the content bodies includes both a browser content body and a service content body (see e.g., Fig. 1).

Finally, the AAPA does not disclose a content assembler distinct from a multiplexer. As illustrated in Fig. 24 of the AAPA, the broadcast system 2500 is devoid of any content assembler distinct from the multiplexer 15. The transmitting apparatus of the present invention, on the other hand, includes both a content assembler and multiplexer; each device having a different function (see e.g., Fig. 1). As illustrated in Fig. 1, the multiplexer 115 receives content from the content assembler 112, and multiplexes the assembled content.

Moreover, after a detailed review of Schell, the reference fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in the AAPA. Accordingly, even if one of ordinary skill in the

art were to combine the teachings of the AAPA and Schell, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 38, 43 and 48. In particular, the AAPA and Schell (individually or in combination) fail to disclose all the features of the claimed "content body pitcher" and "content assembler means."

Thus, independent claims 38, 43 and 48 are patentably distinguished over the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted above. Additionally, dependent claims 39-41, 44-47 and 49-54 are also be patentably distinguished over the cited prior art based at least on their dependency from independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated April 10, 2007, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuteru KATAOKA

By: _____

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicant

MDP(WDH)/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 26, 2007